

DARPA, WWW, & You, & Me, Plus those we love . . .

First, a short overview of my limited knowledge of the phenomenon called "Internet."

Few Internet users have all the pieces of data that go into the operation of Internet provider and regulator choices that ultimately affect Internet use, and users.

Data trunk lines that carry the vital communications traffic, plus the Internet traffic, become susceptible to overload, and loss of vital communication, not a 'good' thing at all.

Commercial data carriers have allowed WWW traffic on their backbone circuits as a token offering of support for the concept of this wonderful communication tool for initial adapters of the WWW. Of course, before that they carried DARPA's 'internet' flow gratis, the underlying protocol for WWW traffic.

With WWW data volume threatening to engulf other, vital data traffic on their backbone circuits, carriers must determine how to either limit that intrusion, dice and slice it into manageable volumes, or simply establish volume adjusters that ultimately cause WWW users inconvenience, loss of access, or financial burden.

No one can take a neutral stand on the impact of the WWW to their well-being, since even the poorest, least access-enabled person on Earth is affected by others' reliance upon WWW channels to bring good, or harm, or governance into their lives.

Now, that role that you play, as participant in mediating between ISP carriers, users, safety and content concerns, and general beneficiary of your own ties to direct and indirect WWW access and relevant interactivities, including and not limited to finance, purchase, privacy, knowledge/research, international peer and governance knowledge, and all the many facets bought into your own life by the WWW:

From where I see this challenge, in the perspective I've gained through studies, education, use, and news, government, traffic carriers, network engineers, and so many other relevant, vital elements of the WWW, no 'best' solution to the threatening flood of WWW traffic can come from a special interest source, such as government, carrier, user, or even from a partial combination of these factors, and many more factors contributing to, or providing services of, the WWW.

I believe History confirms my carefully-chosen advice, which I sincerely hope will help you determine to follow it: Wherever in doubt as to veracity of a witness(Read Commercial Gain-motivated WWW provider(s) in this case), then seek out and understand to your best capacity, including by proxy,

those whom that informer(s)'s proposal will affect.

A little story to illustrate;

The board of Directors for a large commercial farming enterprise determined that if all farmers, under their control or not, limited their planting of a certain seed to one produced by a division of their enterprise holdings, everybody would benefit, from their own bottom line to the consumer. However, a quick check on their corporate structure found that they were controller of a holding conglomerate of farms, research enterprises, and a large consortium of PAC operations funded by their promotions department.

To introduce this proposal to government regulators, they went to a relevant, high-level government office with the proposal that regulating **all** farmers to to uniformly limit their planting to this specific seed, it would benefit everyone, including the public that paid the entire enterprise with their purchasing of the final product.

Then their PAC, already geared up and just idling at the starting line, went into preplanned actions. First, they clobbered the media with 'positive' information that subtly denigrated use of 'inferior' seed, produced by their competitors. Then they requested second-level regulators for focused attention and semi-favoritism to distribution and subtle endorsement of their seed line.

Finally, these commercial thieves went to your peers and superiors with 'unrelated' requests to keep you busy with other activities, because you had a history of opposing their greed-motivated impositions upon congress. In the End, you had too little time to devote due time and resources for assessing the damage their intended regulation would cause, and they simply **bought** their desired regulation.

Fortunately, the regulators targeted by these snakes in Sheep Fleece were savvy about where the corporate operative was activating their nefarious goal, and mounted an investigation with mostly volunteers, to uncover key parts of the covert plan, and with that weight of evidence, a fair oversight system was deployed that all affected parties had top level access to.

That exact scenario is facing you, with the intended WWW regulation enactment proposed by carriers, and other providers of Internet/WWW access to consumers, as it appears from my studied perspective.

Again, I believe History confirms my suggestion to you, that is very likely to effectively define a 'Best' solution to this dilemma;

A. As with the illustration, first determine everyone affected by the proposed regulation, and find peer-qualified spokespeople to represent each party.

B. Determine the many ways and means the proposer(s) are actively, and perhaps covertly enacting support for their proposal(s), then open those facts to all affected parties.

C. With combined knowledge and savvy representatives from all affected parties, form a collective to act as a 'think tank.' Assign specific goals and an open agenda to derive 'best solution' proposal(s) to a second peer-selected group with the commission that they form an open, public-accessible formal recommendation to Congress, with the clear understanding that the proposed regulation will be open to all, and continual participation by all it affects.

D. Whether you have or have not, a particular political view, be certain that you do Not follow the example of the current lopsided, politic-hamstrung Congress, and formulate, agree upon, and 'pass' legislation enacted by unilateral party perspective, as the 'Economic Boost' sell-out by the Obama, et al politik. That is very 'Democrat,' but absolutely a severe travesty of the Oath of Office sworn to by every Congress Member that took part in the theft of their official power.

Sincerely,

Claude Armstrong

The 'canned' response follows . . .

Net Neutrality is essential to free speech, equal opportunity and economic innovation in America. Since the FCC removed this basic protection in 2005, the top executives of phone and cable companies have stated their intention to become the Internet's gatekeepers and to discriminate against Web sites that don't pay their added tolls.

This fundamental change would end the open Internet as we know it. It would damage my ability to connect with others, share information and participate in our 21st century democracy and economy. The FCC must ensure that broadband providers do not block, interfere with or discriminate against any lawful Internet traffic based on its ownership, source or destination.